REMARKS

In the aforenoted Office communication, it is acknowledged claims 10-34 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 4, 5/4, 6/5/4, 7 and 8 have been objected to as containing allowable subject matter and indicated as being allowable if rewritten so as not to depend from a rejected base claim. The remaining claims have been rejected.

Claim 4 has been rewritten as new independent claim 35 and new claims 36-39 correspond respectively with claims 5/4, 6/5/4, 7 and 8. Claims 36-39, being dependent upon new independent claim 35, are felt to be allowable as this set of claims is no longer dependent upon a rejected base claim.

As will be described in more detail hereafter, independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2 and to include other material felt to more clearly distinguish the subject matter thereof from the prior art. Claims 2, 5, and 9 have been canceled, and claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 have been amended to be dependent either directly or indirectly on amended claim 1 and are felt to be allowable for that reason.

Before discussing in more depth the amendments to the previously rejected claims, it is felt beneficial to briefly summarize the prior art utilized in the rejection of the claims. The patent to Rundo was cited as disclosing a system for diverting a tacky sealant strip while winding the strip onto a take-up drum even though it should be noted the strip is a single strip of material that is wound on the drum at a diagonal so that a tacky side of the strip engages a non-sticking liner on the opposite face of the tape.

The patent to Nowak was cited as disclosing a method for uniformly winding elongated sheets of material onto a roller while diverting the strips of material back and

forth as the individual strips are wrapped on individual reels associated with each strip. The diverter system for moving a strip back and forth within its associated reel includes channels on a shuttle bar through which the strip slides as the shuttle bar is shifted back and forth. It should be noted that the strips are in fact individual unassociated strips and are handled independently of each other even though by one apparatus.

In the present invention, the inventors were dealing with a problem totally diverse from the prior art and particularly where one web of material had strips of adhesive applied thereto and rendered inert before further processing. The further processing included cutting the web into a plurality of substantially contiguous strips and then processing the strips while wrapping them on a take-up drum so that the beads of inert adhesive did not stack on each other but rather stacked on the take-up drum in slightly offset positions relative to underlying and overlying layers of the web. In the present invention, the strips of material defined within the web are processed as a unit so that the entire web is shifted laterally back and forth rather than each individual strip within the web. In order to have dependable shifting of the strips as the web is shifted laterally, fingers are positioned between adjacent substantially contiguous strips so that the entire web can be moved without displacing the strips within the web.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to state the web of material is divided into substantially contiguous separate strips and wherein the strips have lateral edges and wherein the diverter system includes a traverse comb with fingers for engaging the lateral edges of the strips and a drive mechanism operatively connected to the traverse comb for reciprocally moving the traverse comb laterally of the roller to cause the web to move reciprocally and laterally as a unit as it is wound onto a roller. It should be

appreciated, the system as claimed is for processing a web of material that has been segregated into substantially contiguous strips and the web is reciprocally and laterally moved as a unit and in a manner so that the strips are individually engaged with the comb so that the web can be moved as a unit. Inasmuch as the prior art fails to disclose a system as now defined in claim 1, it is felt claim 1 is patentably distinct from the prior art. Claims 3, 4, and 6-8 have been amended to have consistent terminology with amended claim 1 and so as to be dependent either directly or indirectly thereon and for that reason are also felt to be allowable.

The specification has been amended to incorporate the language referencing the substantially contiguous relationship of the strips to provide antecedent basis in the specification for the use of that language in the claims. This amendment to the specification and the claims is not felt to constitute new matter as this relationship of the strips is clearly evident from the original specification and the drawings. The specification has also noted the strips are moved as a unit to also provide antecedent basis for that reference in amended claim 1.

Having responded to the aforenoted Office communication by placing the claims which were objected to in a form so as not to be dependent upon a rejected base claim, i.e. new claims 35-39, and having amended claims 1, 3, and 6-8 so as to be clearly patentably distinct from the prior art, it is felt the claims in the application are now in allowable form. Since there were no objections or rejections of the specification, it is felt the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is courteously requested.

Dated this 12th day of April 2005.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary M. Polumbus, Reg. No. 25,364
USPTO Customer No. 20686
Tel: (303) 628-1500
Fax: (303) 629-3450
e-mail: polumbus.gary@dorsey.com

GMP/dtc
cc: HDBV and HDI (HN-069.03-353).